

REMARKS

This Amendment, submitted in response to the Office Action dated July 28, 2005, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-30 are all the claims pending in the application.

I. Preliminary Matters

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner approve the drawings filed April 13, 2001, by marking acceptance of the drawings in the next Office Action.

II. Rejection of claims 1-4, 6, 7, 10-13, 15-19 and 21-28 under §103(e)

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 10-13, 15-19 and 21-28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(e) as being anticipated by Nagasaka (USP 6,529,049).

A printing system of an exemplary embodiment of the present invention includes “a correcting information provider” to obtain individual color characteristics of a plurality of printers. Thus, even though color characteristics vary depending upon each printer, a color image can be corrected in accordance with color characteristics of each printer. Consequently, images having the same color as the actual goods (items) can be printed.

On the other hand, a print data transfer system of Nagasaka merely prints out images in accordance with image data to be input. Specifically, Nagasaka fails to teach or suggest a concept for correcting a color image. Consequently, images having the same color as the actual goods (items) cannot always be printed.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims should be deemed allowable. To the extent claims 25 and 28 recite similar elements, claims 25 and 28 and their dependent claims should also be deemed allowable.

III. Rejection of claims 5 and 14 under § 103(a)

Claims 5 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagasaka in view of Kuwata et al. (USP 6,404,509). Claims 5 and 15 should be deemed allowable by virtue of their dependency to claim 1 for the reasons set forth above.

IV. Rejection of claim 30 under § 103(a)

Claim 30 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagasaka in view of Gu (USP 5,874,988). Claim 30 should be deemed allowable by virtue of its dependency to claim 1 for the reasons set forth above.

V. Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has indicated that claims 8, 9, and 20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. At the present time, Applicant has not rewritten claims 8, 9 and 20 in independent form since Applicant believes claims 8, 9 and 20 will be deemed allowable by virtue of their dependency to claim 1 for the reasons set forth above.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)
Appln. No.: 09/833,786

Attorney Docket No.: Q64077

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER


Ruthleen E. Uy
Registration No. 51,361

Date: October 28, 2005